

THE TRUE AMERICAN.

Devoted to Universal Liberty; Gradual Emancipation in Kentucky; Literature; Agriculture; Elevation

of Labor. Morally and Politically; Commercial Intelligence, &c. &c.

VOLUME I.

LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY, TUESDAY,

JULY 8, 1845.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED WEEKLY, BY
WILLIAM L. NEALE,
On North Main-street, three doors above the corner, at Two Dollars and Fifty Cents per annum, in advance, or Three Dollars if not paid within three months.

Five copies will be furnished to a club for Ten Dollars, or Ten copies for Twenty Dollars.
Subscriptions out of Kentucky payable in advance.

ADVERTISING.

One square, or less, three insertions, \$1.50
For each subsequent insertion, 25
One square, three months, 4.00
One square, six months, 7.00
One square, twelve months, 12.00

The very large and increasing circulation of the *True American*, in this and other States, will render it a better advertising medium than any paper in the city.

PoETRY.

From the Odd Fellow's Gem.

FRIENDSHIP, LOVE AND TRUTH.

FRAMING.

There is a star that beams on high,

With lovely, tender rays;

That lights the path of generous worth,

And spreads a brighter day.

LOVE.

There is a tie, a golden chain,

That binds with stronger hand

Than iron shackles of the cell,

Or all the arts of man.

TRUTH.

There is a gem, a pearl of worth,

As lasting as the skies;

More dazzling than the gems of earth,

Its splendor never dies.

From the United States Journal.

MY HOME.

My home is where the ocean's surf

Rolts glittering up the sunny shore;

Where rivers bathe the flowery turf,

Or down the craggy mountain roar.

My home is where the eagle spreads

His wings for heaven's unbounded dome;

Where man in conscious freedom treads;

The soil he holds yields him his own.

My home is where the rod man trod

Upon the mountain's stony way;

For the lone Pilgrim looked to God

While on the wide and stormy sea.

My home is where the pines bind

With holy hemlocks fill'd the air,

And by their pines the wind has there.

From savage foes—my home is there.

J. H. H.

ANTI-SLAVERY.

ADDRESS.

TO THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES,
ADOPTED BY THE ANTI-SLAVERY CONVENTION
AT CINCINNATI, JUNE, 1845.

[continued.]

We propose to effect this by repealing all legislation, and discontinuing all action in favor of slavery, at home and abroad; by prohibiting the practice of slaveholding in all places of exclusive national jurisdiction, in the District of Columbia, in American vessels upon the seas, in forts, arsenals, navy yards; by forbidding the employment of slaves upon any public work; by adopting resolutions in Congress declaring that slaveholding in all States created out of national territories, is unconstitutional, and recommending to the others the immediate adoption of measures for its extinction within their respective limits; and by electing and appointing to public station such men, and only such men, as openly avow our principles, and will honestly carry out our measures.

The constitutionality of this line of action cannot be successfully impeached. That it will terminate, if steadily pursued, in the utter overthrow of slavery at no very distant day, none will doubt. We adopt it because we desire, through and by the Constitution, to attain the great ends which the Constitution itself proposes, the establishment of justice, and the security of liberty. We insist not here upon the opinions of some, that no slaveholding in any State of the Union is compatible with a true and just construction of the Constitution; nor upon the opinions of others, that the Declaration of Independence setting forth the creed of the nation, that all men are created equal and endowed by their Creator with an inalienable right of liberty, must be regarded as the Common Law of America, antecedent to and unimpaired by the Constitution; nor need we appeal to the doctrine that slaveholding is contrary to the Supreme Law of the Supreme Ruler, preceding and controlling all human law, and binding upon all legislatures in the enactment of laws, and upon all courts in the administration of justice. We are willing to take our stand upon propositions generally conceded:—that slaveholding is contrary to natural right and justice; that it can subsist nowhere without the sanction and aid of positive legislation; that the Constitution expressly prohibits Congress from depriving any person of liberty without due process of law. From these propositions we deduce, by logical inference, the doctrines upon which we insist. We deprecate all discord among the States; but do not dread discord so much as we do the subjugation of the States and the people to the yoke of the Slaveholding Oligarchy. We deprecate the dissolution of the Union, as a dreadful political calamity; but if any of the States shall preface dissolution to submission to the Constitutional action of the people on the subject of slavery, we cannot purchase their alliance by the sacrifice of inestimable rights and the abandonment of sacred duties.

Such, fellow-citizens, are our views, principles, and objects. We invite your co-operation in the great work of delivering our beloved country from the evils of slavery. No question half so important as that of slavery, engages the attention of the American people. All others, in fact, dwindle into insignificance in comparison with it. The question of slavery is, and until it shall be settled, must be, the paramount moral and political question of the day. We, at least, so regard it; and, so regarding it, must subordinate every other question to it.

It follows as a necessary consequence, that we cannot yield our political support to any party which does not take our ground upon this question.

What then is the position of the political parties of this country in relation to this

subject? One of these parties professes to be guided by the most liberal principles,—“Equal and exact justice to all men”; “equal rights for all men”; “inflexible opposition to oppression,” are its favorite mottoes. It claims to be the true friend of popular government, and assumes the name of democratic. Among its members are doubtless many who cherish its professions as sacred principles, and believe that the great cause of Freedom and Progress is to be served by promoting its ascendancy. But when we compare the maxims of the so-called democratic party with its acts, its hypocrisy is plainly revealed. Among its leading members we find the principal slaveholders, the Chiefs of the Oligarchy. It has never scrupled to sacrifice the rights of the people to the demands of the Slave Power. Like Sir Pertinax McSeycophant, its northern leaders believe that the great secret of advancement lies in “bowing well.” No servility seems too gross, no self-degradation too great, to be submitted to. They think themselves well rewarded, if the unity of the Party can be preserved, and the spoils of victory secured, if, in the distribution of those spoils, they receive only the jackall’s share, they content themselves with the reflection that little is better than nothing. They declaim loudly against all monopolies, all special privileges, all encroachments on personal rights, all distinctions founded upon birth, and compensate themselves for these efforts of virtue by practising the vilest oppression upon all other countrymen in whose complexions the slightest trace of African derivation can be detected.

Profoudly do we revere the maxims of True Democracy; they are identical with those of True Christianity, in relation to the rights and duties of men as citizens. And our reverence for Democratic Principles is the precise measure of our detestation of the policy of those who are permitted to shape the action of the Democratic Party. Political concert with that party under its present leadership, is, therefore, plainly impossible. Nor do we entertain the hope, which many, no doubt, honestly cherish, that the professed principles of the party will at length bring it right upon the question of slavery. Its professed principles have been the same for near half a century, and the subjection of the party to the slave power is, at this moment, as complete as ever. There is no prospect of any change for the better, until those democrats whose hearts are really possessed by a genuine love of liberty for all, and by an honest hatred of oppression, shall manfully assert their individual independence, and refuse their support to the panders of slavery.

There is another party which boasts that it is conservative in its character. Its watchwords are “a tariff,” “a banking system,” “the Union as it is.” Among its members, also, are many sincere opponents of slavery; and the party itself, seeking aid in the attainment of power, and anxious to carry its favorite measures, and bound together by no such professed principles as secure the unity of the Democratic Party, often concedes much to their anti-slavery views. It is not unwilling, in those States and parts of States where anti-slavery sentiment prevails, to assume an anti-slavery attitude and claim to be an anti-slavery party. Like the Democratic party, however, the Whig party maintains alliances with the slaveholders. It proposes, in its national conventions, no notion against slavery. It is conservative in its character. Its watchwords are “a tariff,” “a banking system,” “the Union as it is.” Among its members, also, are many sincere opponents of slavery; and the party itself, seeking aid in the attainment of power, and anxious to carry its favorite measures, and bound together by no such professed principles as secure the unity of the Democratic Party, often concedes much to their anti-slavery views. It is not unwilling, in those States and parts of States where anti-slavery sentiment prevails, to assume an anti-slavery attitude and claim to be an anti-slavery party. Like the Democratic party, however, the Whig party maintains alliances with the slaveholders. It proposes, in its national conventions, no notion against slavery. It is conservative in its character. Its watchwords are “a tariff,” “a banking system,” “the Union as it is.” Among its members, also, are many sincere opponents of slavery; and the party itself, seeking aid in the attainment of power, and anxious to carry its favorite measures, and bound together by no such professed principles as secure the unity of the Democratic Party, often concedes much to their anti-slavery views. It is not unwilling, in those States and parts of States where anti-slavery sentiment prevails, to assume an anti-slavery attitude and claim to be an anti-slavery party. Like the Democratic party, however, the Whig party maintains alliances with the slaveholders. It proposes, in its national conventions, no notion against slavery. It is conservative in its character. Its watchwords are “a tariff,” “a banking system,” “the Union as it is.” Among its members, also, are many sincere opponents of slavery; and the party itself, seeking aid in the attainment of power, and anxious to carry its favorite measures, and bound together by no such professed principles as secure the unity of the Democratic Party, often concedes much to their anti-slavery views. It is not unwilling, in those States and parts of States where anti-slavery sentiment prevails, to assume an anti-slavery attitude and claim to be an anti-slavery party. Like the Democratic party, however, the Whig party maintains alliances with the slaveholders. It proposes, in its national conventions, no notion against slavery. It is conservative in its character. Its watchwords are “a tariff,” “a banking system,” “the Union as it is.” Among its members, also, are many sincere opponents of slavery; and the party itself, seeking aid in the attainment of power, and anxious to carry its favorite measures, and bound together by no such professed principles as secure the unity of the Democratic Party, often concedes much to their anti-slavery views. It is not unwilling, in those States and parts of States where anti-slavery sentiment prevails, to assume an anti-slavery attitude and claim to be an anti-slavery party. Like the Democratic party, however, the Whig party maintains alliances with the slaveholders. It proposes, in its national conventions, no notion against slavery. It is conservative in its character. Its watchwords are “a tariff,” “a banking system,” “the Union as it is.” Among its members, also, are many sincere opponents of slavery; and the party itself, seeking aid in the attainment of power, and anxious to carry its favorite measures, and bound together by no such professed principles as secure the unity of the Democratic Party, often concedes much to their anti-slavery views. It is not unwilling, in those States and parts of States where anti-slavery sentiment prevails, to assume an anti-slavery attitude and claim to be an anti-slavery party. Like the Democratic party, however, the Whig party maintains alliances with the slaveholders. It proposes, in its national conventions, no notion against slavery. It is conservative in its character. Its watchwords are “a tariff,” “a banking system,” “the Union as it is.” Among its members, also, are many sincere opponents of slavery; and the party itself, seeking aid in the attainment of power, and anxious to carry its favorite measures, and bound together by no such professed principles as secure the unity of the Democratic Party, often concedes much to their anti-slavery views. It is not unwilling, in those States and parts of States where anti-slavery sentiment prevails, to assume an anti-slavery attitude and claim to be an anti-slavery party. Like the Democratic party, however, the Whig party maintains alliances with the slaveholders. It proposes, in its national conventions, no notion against slavery. It is conservative in its character. Its watchwords are “a tariff,” “a banking system,” “the Union as it is.” Among its members, also, are many sincere opponents of slavery; and the party itself, seeking aid in the attainment of power, and anxious to carry its favorite measures, and bound together by no such professed principles as secure the unity of the Democratic Party, often concedes much to their anti-slavery views. It is not unwilling, in those States and parts of States where anti-slavery sentiment prevails, to assume an anti-slavery attitude and claim to be an anti-slavery party. Like the Democratic party, however, the Whig party maintains alliances with the slaveholders. It proposes, in its national conventions, no notion against slavery. It is conservative in its character. Its watchwords are “a tariff,” “a banking system,” “the Union as it is.” Among its members, also, are many sincere opponents of slavery; and the party itself, seeking aid in the attainment of power, and anxious to carry its favorite measures, and bound together by no such professed principles as secure the unity of the Democratic Party, often concedes much to their anti-slavery views. It is not unwilling, in those States and parts of States where anti-slavery sentiment prevails, to assume an anti-slavery attitude and claim to be an anti-slavery party. Like the Democratic party, however, the Whig party maintains alliances with the slaveholders. It proposes, in its national conventions, no notion against slavery. It is conservative in its character. Its watchwords are “a tariff,” “a banking system,” “the Union as it is.” Among its members, also, are many sincere opponents of slavery; and the party itself, seeking aid in the attainment of power, and anxious to carry its favorite measures, and bound together by no such professed principles as secure the unity of the Democratic Party, often concedes much to their anti-slavery views. It is not unwilling, in those States and parts of States where anti-slavery sentiment prevails, to assume an anti-slavery attitude and claim to be an anti-slavery party. Like the Democratic party, however, the Whig party maintains alliances with the slaveholders. It proposes, in its national conventions, no notion against slavery. It is conservative in its character. Its watchwords are “a tariff,” “a banking system,” “the Union as it is.” Among its members, also, are many sincere opponents of slavery; and the party itself, seeking aid in the attainment of power, and anxious to carry its favorite measures, and bound together by no such professed principles as secure the unity of the Democratic Party, often concedes much to their anti-slavery views. It is not unwilling, in those States and parts of States where anti-slavery sentiment prevails, to assume an anti-slavery attitude and claim to be an anti-slavery party. Like the Democratic party, however, the Whig party maintains alliances with the slaveholders. It proposes, in its national conventions, no notion against slavery. It is conservative in its character. Its watchwords are “a tariff,” “a banking system,” “the Union as it is.” Among its members, also, are many sincere opponents of slavery; and the party itself, seeking aid in the attainment of power, and anxious to carry its favorite measures, and bound together by no such professed principles as secure the unity of the Democratic Party, often concedes much to their anti-slavery views. It is not unwilling, in those States and parts of States where anti-slavery sentiment prevails, to assume an anti-slavery attitude and claim to be an anti-slavery party. Like the Democratic party, however, the Whig party maintains alliances with the slaveholders. It proposes, in its national conventions, no notion against slavery. It is conservative in its character. Its watchwords are “a tariff,” “a banking system,” “the Union as it is.” Among its members, also, are many sincere opponents of slavery; and the party itself, seeking aid in the attainment of power, and anxious to carry its favorite measures, and bound together by no such professed principles as secure the unity of the Democratic Party, often concedes much to their anti-slavery views. It is not unwilling, in those States and parts of States where anti-slavery sentiment prevails, to assume an anti-slavery attitude and claim to be an anti-slavery party. Like the Democratic party, however, the Whig party maintains alliances with the slaveholders. It proposes, in its national conventions, no notion against slavery. It is conservative in its character. Its watchwords are “a tariff,” “a banking system,” “the Union as it is.” Among its members, also, are many sincere opponents of slavery; and the party itself, seeking aid in the attainment of power, and anxious to carry its favorite measures, and bound together by no such professed principles as secure the unity of the Democratic Party, often concedes much to their anti-slavery views. It is not unwilling, in those States and parts of States where anti-slavery sentiment prevails, to assume an anti-slavery attitude and claim to be an anti-slavery party. Like the Democratic party, however, the Whig party maintains alliances with the slaveholders. It proposes, in its national conventions, no notion against slavery. It is conservative in its character. Its watchwords are “a tariff,” “a banking system,” “the Union as it is.” Among its members, also, are many sincere opponents of slavery; and the party itself, seeking aid in the attainment of power, and anxious to carry its favorite measures, and bound together by no such professed principles as secure the unity of the Democratic Party, often concedes much to their anti-slavery views. It is not unwilling, in those States and parts of States where anti-slavery sentiment prevails, to assume an anti-slavery attitude and claim to be an anti-slavery party. Like the Democratic party, however, the Whig party maintains alliances with the slaveholders. It proposes, in its national conventions, no notion against slavery. It is conservative in its character. Its watchwords are “a tariff,” “a banking system,” “the Union as it is.” Among its members, also, are many sincere opponents of slavery; and the party itself, seeking aid in the attainment of power, and anxious to carry its favorite measures, and bound together by no such professed principles as secure the unity of the Democratic Party, often concedes much to their anti-slavery views. It is not unwilling, in those States and parts of States where anti-slavery sentiment prevails, to assume an anti-slavery attitude and claim to be an anti-slavery party. Like the Democratic party, however, the Whig party maintains alliances with the slaveholders. It proposes, in its national conventions, no notion against slavery. It is conservative in its character. Its watchwords are “a tariff,” “a banking system,” “the Union as it is.” Among its members, also, are many sincere opponents of slavery; and the party itself, seeking aid in the attainment of power, and anxious to carry its favorite measures, and bound together by no such professed principles as secure the unity of the Democratic Party, often concedes much to their anti-slavery views. It is not unwilling, in those States and parts of States where anti-slavery sentiment prevails, to assume an anti-slavery attitude and claim to be an anti-slavery party. Like the Democratic party, however, the Whig party maintains alliances with the slaveholders. It proposes, in its national conventions, no notion against slavery. It is conservative in its character. Its watchwords are “a tariff,” “a banking system,” “the Union as it is.” Among its members, also, are many sincere opponents of slavery; and the party itself, seeking aid in the attainment of power, and anxious to carry its favorite measures, and bound together by no such professed principles as secure the unity of the Democratic Party, often concedes much to their anti-slavery views. It is not unwilling, in those States and parts of States where anti-slavery sentiment prevails, to assume an anti-slavery attitude and claim to be an anti-slavery party. Like the Democratic party, however, the Whig party maintains alliances with the slaveholders. It proposes, in its national conventions, no notion against slavery. It is conservative in its character. Its watchwords are “a tariff,” “a banking system,” “the Union as it is.” Among its members, also, are many sincere opponents of slavery; and the party itself, seeking aid in the attainment of power, and anxious to carry its favorite measures, and bound together by no such professed principles as secure the unity of the Democratic Party, often concedes much to their anti-slavery views. It is not unwilling, in those States and parts of States where anti-slavery sentiment prevails, to assume an anti-slavery attitude and claim to be an anti-slavery party. Like the Democratic party, however, the Whig party maintains alliances with the slaveholders. It proposes, in its national conventions, no notion against slavery. It is conservative in its character. Its watchwords are “a tariff,” “a banking system,” “the Union as it is.” Among its members, also, are many sincere opponents of slavery; and the party itself, seeking aid in the attainment of power, and anxious to carry its favorite measures, and bound together by no such professed principles as secure the unity of the Democratic Party, often concedes much to their anti-slavery views. It is not unwilling, in those States and parts of States where anti-slavery sentiment prevails, to assume an anti-slavery attitude and claim to be an anti-slavery party. Like the Democratic party, however, the Whig party maintains alliances with the slaveholders. It proposes, in its national conventions, no notion against slavery. It is conservative in its character. Its watchwords are “a tariff,” “a banking system,” “the Union as it is.” Among its members, also, are many sincere opponents of slavery; and the party itself, seeking aid in the attainment of power, and anxious to carry its favorite measures, and bound together by no such professed principles as secure the unity of the Democratic Party, often concedes much to their anti-slavery views. It is not unwilling, in those States and parts of States where anti-slavery sentiment prevails, to assume an anti-slavery attitude and claim to be an anti-slavery party. Like the Democratic party, however, the Whig party maintains alliances with the slaveholders. It proposes, in its national conventions, no notion against slavery. It is conservative in its character. Its watchwords are “a tariff,” “a banking system,” “the Union as it is.” Among its members, also, are many sincere opponents of slavery; and the party itself, seeking aid in the attainment of power, and anxious to carry its favorite measures, and bound together by no such professed principles as secure the unity of the Democratic Party, often concedes much to their anti-slavery views. It is not unwilling, in those States and parts of States where anti-slavery sentiment prevails, to assume an anti-slavery attitude and claim to be an anti-slavery party. Like the Democratic party, however, the Whig party maintains alliances with the slaveholders. It proposes, in its national conventions, no notion against slavery. It is conservative in its character. Its watchwords are “a tariff,” “a banking system,” “the Union as it is.” Among its members, also, are many sincere opponents of slavery; and the party itself, seeking aid in the attainment of power, and anxious to carry its favorite measures, and bound together by no such professed principles as secure the unity of the Democratic Party, often concedes much to their anti-slavery views. It is not unwilling, in those States and parts of States where anti-slavery sentiment prevails, to assume an anti-slavery attitude and claim to be an anti-slavery party. Like the Democratic party, however, the Whig party maintains alliances with the slaveholders. It proposes, in its national conventions, no notion against slavery. It is conservative in its character. Its watchwords are “a tariff,” “a banking system,” “the Union as it is.” Among its members, also, are many sincere opponents of slavery; and the party itself, seeking aid in the attainment of power, and anxious to carry its favorite measures, and bound together by no such professed principles as secure the unity of the Democratic Party, often concedes much to their anti-slavery views. It is not unwilling, in those States and parts of States where anti-slavery sentiment prevails, to assume an anti-slavery attitude and claim to be an anti-slavery party. Like the Democratic party, however, the Whig party maintains alliances with the slaveholders. It proposes, in its national conventions, no notion against slavery. It is conservative in its character. Its watchwords are “a tariff,” “a banking system,” “the Union as it is.” Among its members, also, are many sincere opponents of slavery; and the party itself, seeking aid in the attainment of power, and anxious to carry its favorite measures, and bound together by no such professed principles as secure the unity of the Democratic Party, often concedes much to their anti-slavery views. It is not unwilling, in those States and parts of States where anti-slavery sentiment prevails, to assume an anti-slavery attitude and claim to be an anti-sl

ANTI-SLAVERY.
COMMUNICATIONS.

For the True American.

NO. II.

In a former number it was remarked that almost all admit that slavery in the abstract, is wrong, but contend that its continuance is justified by the peculiar circumstances under which it exists in this country, and the difficulties attendant upon its removal. This mode of quieting the sense of justice, however, often unsuccessful and unsatisfactory, lies in the minds of those who rely most upon it, there is an apparent uneasiness—a struggle similar, though less violent, in its character, to that in the mind of the Danish King, when racked by conscience, he determines to pray for the pardon of his crime, the great dramatist makes him exclaim:

"But, O, what form of prayer
Can serve my turn? Forgive me my foul murder!
This cannot be; since I am still possessed
Of those effects for which I did the murder,
My crown, mine own ambition and my queen,
May ever be pardoned and retain the offence."

It requires no argument to prove that a man, who finds himself compelled by circumstances to the commission of a great wrong every day of his life, and makes no effort to free himself from his unnatural position, is just as guilty as if those circumstances did not exist—just as guilty as if the wrong had been wilfully committed in the first instance and continued by choice. A man may steal rather than starve, when there is no other possible means by which he can appease his hunger, and all will excuse him; but so soon as he can, by the utmost exertion, place himself in a situation to obtain a livelihood by honest means, he would be no longer excusable—it would not do for him to make his thefts habitual, and allege in justification that it is easier to steal than to labor.—And if slavery were wrong in itself, can we avoid a share in the guilt in its continuance, by alleging that it has been entailed upon us without our consent, and that there are great difficulties in the way of its abolition, whilst we calmly fold our arms, without making a single effort to remove or overcome those difficulties, ad without even examining their nature or extent? Every intelligent and conscientious man must answer, no—Well may we exclaim,

"May we be pardoned and retain the offence?" These are questions, however, which men, in whom interest and prejudice are stronger than conscience and the sense of justice, do not wish to ask themselves. Hence that irritant sensibility evinced by the advocate of slavery whenever the subject is approached—a sensibility utterly inexplicable in men conscious of right and confident in their position—hence the maddened hostility to the advocate of emancipation—hence the vain attempts, by means, however violent and improper, to stifle inquiry and silence discussion. The wound is too sore to be probed, though that be the only hope of its cure—whilst the gangrene and corruption are spreading towards the very vitals with fearful progress, men prefer to trust to the hopes of time, fate as they must feel them to be, rather than submit to the comparatively trifling pain and inconvenience of a certain and speedy remedy.

In the state of mind which I have endeavored to describe, it would be amusing, were it not rather lamentable, to witness the trembling, nervous eagerness, with which the advocate of slavery grasps at every thing tenuis, even in the remotest degree, to prove that perhaps slavery is not wrong after all. The Bible, nay, the Bible, is ransacked from Genesis to the Apocalypses—its leaves are turned by numerous fingers—its pages gazed upon by eyes all unused to its sacred revelations—a verse is picked out here and a line there, and for what? To prove that oppression is no sin and tyranny no crime—to prove that one follower of Christ may by force, compel his fellow Christian, "cursed with a skin not colored like his own," to labor for him without reward—that the same lower of Christ may without sin, into the wife and children of his fellow Christian and sell them, a thousand miles apart, into a hopeless and relentless slavery—that it is right to abolish the marriage relation—that it is right for one man to deprive another of mental, moral and religious improvement, and of the means of obtaining it—for these slavery—they are not mere excesses, upon or unnecessary and accidental incidents to the system—they are the system itself. But more than this. The slavery existing in the time of the Apostles, was the Roman system, which placed not only the labor, the liberty and the happiness of the slave in the hands of his master, but life itself, and many a poor wretch, for offences the most trifling and for no offence, has been thrown into the fish-pond of his master, a food for his fish—and all this, the argument from the Bible must justify, or it proves nothing. Can it be that the Bible, whose prime command is, "do unto others as ye would that others should do unto you"—which was sent by Him, who declares himself "no respecter of persons," and who sought companionship when on earth with the humblest of the land, to proclaim peace and good will to man—which breathes in its every page the very spirit of liberty—the elevation of man's (*or man's*) moral nature? Can it be that such a book justifies these? Would not the man who should prove slavery to be right by an argument from the Bible, do more to disprove the Divine origin of the Christian religion than man has ever yet done. Men have attempted to prove almost every conceivable absurdity by appeal to the Bible, but let us not, fellow citizens, whatever else we may do, attempt to base our system of slavery upon it. The Bible, nay seek in the Bible for a divine right to their slaves with the same hope of inking out a plausible title, but let the advocate of slavery shut it as he would his own condemnation.

Yet strange as it may seem, and it is "passing strange,"—learned divines (few of them, to the honor of the profession be it spoken,) have been found to lend their learning, talents and influence to the doctrine of the divine origin of slavery, thus dealing a blow, as deadly as their feeble powers will allow, to the very religion which it is their business to preach and defend. The exertion of their energies and influence in the moral and religious improvement of those slaves whose letters they are attempting to rivet more firmly, would be much more in accordance with the spirit of the Gospel they profess.

The historian of the Spanish conquests, regarded by us as so horrible, finds some palliation of the conduct of the conquerors, in the fact that in the unenlightened civilization of that age, it was generally believed by the church, and by every true son of the church, to be not only the right, but the duty of christians to conquer the heathen and reduce them to force by the true religion.

May not the future history of our times, find some excuse for us in the fact that our civilization, enlightened as it was, had still much of darkness mingled with it, so much that our most learned divines taught that slavery was recognized and justified by the Bible?

LIBERTAS.

For the True American.

FAVETON, JUNE 28, 1845.

MR. EDITOR.—Although the "True American" is more particularly devoted to the political bearing of slavery, yet its moral character, it is believed, will claim a share of your attention. Perhaps the great majority of slaveholders regard the institution of slavery as having received the sanction of Christ and his Apostles, because the New Testament contains no positive prohibition of it, and because it regulates the relation of slave and master, and prescribes the duties of each. If the ground on which this argument is predicated be correct, their military despotism, and the persecution, imprisonment and death of those who dared to worship God, and acknowledge the claims of Christianity, have sanction of Christ and his Apostles, for these things existed, uncondemned, under the eyes of the Apostles, in the bloody reign of Nero. That Christ sanctioned the persecution and death of his foolish worshippers no one will pretend. The Bible doctrine of slavery is clearly defined by an able writer of the present day in the following language:

"Let us consider, for a moment, what we are about when we allow that Christianity, as taught by

the Apostles, sanctioned and justified the system of slavery, as it existed in the Roman Empire.—Slaves were obtained by war, by purchase of traders, and by inheritance, and some by involuntary sale, and others to pay debts, and the rest by birth. But we should estimate it moral and political consequences to us remain silent on a subject so close interesting to us in all our domestic and political relations; one which intermingles itself with every interest and concern of life; productive, perhaps, of a few transient benefits, but certainly of an infinity of evils, greater than we can see, and portending general desolation in future.

We waive, at present, the considerations of religion and humanity which belong to this momentous subject; and present it as a naked question of political wisdom and safety. While we believe in the principles of justice and general prosperity, which it is the province of statesmen to defend and extend to protect and cherish, we are deplorably ignorant as they had before their capture, enjoyed the means of education. Now convince the world that this system or "institution" was sanctioned, sustained, justified by the voices of our blessed Lord, who received their doctrine from his own lips, and despite all evidence by which their claims were set aside, the world will be driven into infidelity. It cannot be believed that such a system of wrong and outrage can be approved of God.

The truth is, the whole system is assented and condemned by the fundamental principles of the gospel, and by the principles of justice and safety, which it is the duty of statesmen to defend and sustain.

The evil could be remedied, to a great extent, by the abolition of the law of mastership.

Those who cannot abide the appointed time,

would strike off at a blow, the manacles of

both African and European slavery. Let them beware of French revolutions, and study to make haste slowly. All slavery is dying out, and all attempts to extend or perpetuate it are "too late." —*Dollar Magazine.*

has not reached the qualified liberty of the present day, without ages of oppression, at the hand of the rich and powerful, who turn us up and down, and beat us down. But we should estimate it moral and political consequences to us remain silent on a subject so close interesting to us in all our domestic and political relations; one which intermingles itself with every interest and concern of life; productive, perhaps, of a few transient benefits, but certainly of an infinity of evils, greater than we can see, and portending general desolation in future.

We waive, at present, the considerations of

religion and humanity which belong to this momentous subject; and present it as a naked question of political wisdom and safety.

While we believe in the principles of justice and general prosperity,

which it is the province of statesmen to defend and extend to protect and cherish, we are deplorably ignorant as they had before their capture, enjoyed the means of education. Now convince the world that this system or "institution" was sanctioned, sustained, justified by the voices of our blessed Lord, who received their doctrine from his own lips, and despite all evidence by which their claims were set aside, the world will be driven into infidelity. It cannot be believed that such a system of wrong and outrage can be approved of God.

The truth is, the whole system is assented and condemned by the fundamental principles of the gospel, and by the principles of justice and safety, which it is the duty of statesmen to defend and sustain.

The evil could be remedied, to a great extent, by the abolition of the law of mastership.

Those who cannot abide the appointed time,

would strike off at a blow, the manacles of

both African and European slavery. Let them beware of French revolutions, and study to make haste slowly. All slavery is dying out, and all attempts to extend or perpetuate it are "too late." —*Dollar Magazine.*

MISCELLANY.

For the True American.

THE PARTING OF CORINNA & OSWALD.

"Farewell!—Farewell!" again, and yet again, That word of anguish came upon her, And her sick heart turned thitherward from the sound.

Which brought its desolation—on her face

The mighty struggle of her soul was traced

To wild tempestuous changes, and a dark

And ominous passage of the cloud which cast

Its shadow o'er her coming life was set,

Pall-like upon her spirit. Stricken, mute

She stood before the idol of her soul,

And gazed upon his face in voiceless woe.

And ever, as he turned to leave her sight,

She stretched towards him one imploring hand

Which clutched his steps, and then relaxed again

Into its nerveless listlessness. Once more

His foot was on the threshold, and her eyes

Grew dim with their intensity of grief,

Chained as they were to his retreating form.

She could not speak—her lips were sealed by woe.

And with a sigh whereof her tortured heart

At last found bitter intercession—she sank

Lifeless upon the marble floor, and blood

Gushed from her regal forehead as she fell:

Oswald knelt down beside her, and in low

And brochetonnes of tremulous agony,

Called on the name of her so lately loved,

And gazed upon his face in voiceless woe.

And ever, as he turned to leave her sight,

She stretched towards him one imploring hand

Which clutched his steps, and then relaxed again

Into its nerveless listlessness. Once more

His foot was on the threshold, and her eyes

Grew dim with their intensity of grief,

Chained as they were to his retreating form.

She could not speak—her lips were sealed by woe.

And with a sigh whereof her tortured heart

At last found bitter intercession—she sank

Lifeless upon the marble floor, and blood

Gushed from her regal forehead as she fell:

Oswald knelt down beside her, and in low

And brochetonnes of tremulous agony,

Called on the name of her so lately loved,

And gazed upon his face in voiceless woe.

And ever, as he turned to leave her sight,

She stretched towards him one imploring hand

Which clutched his steps, and then relaxed again

Into its nerveless listlessness. Once more

His foot was on the threshold, and her eyes

Grew dim with their intensity of grief,

Chained as they were to his retreating form.

She could not speak—her lips were sealed by woe.

And with a sigh whereof her tortured heart

At last found bitter intercession—she sank

Lifeless upon the marble floor, and blood

Gushed from her regal forehead as she fell:

Oswald knelt down beside her, and in low

And brochetonnes of tremulous agony,

Called on the name of her so lately loved,

And gazed upon his face in voiceless woe.

And ever, as he turned to leave her sight,

She stretched towards him one imploring hand

Which clutched his steps, and then relaxed again

Into its nerveless listlessness. Once more

His foot was on the threshold, and her eyes

Grew dim with their intensity of grief,

Chained as they were to his retreating form.

She could not speak—her lips were sealed by woe.

And with a sigh whereof her tortured heart

At last found bitter intercession—she sank

Lifeless upon the marble floor, and blood

Gushed from her regal forehead as she fell:

Oswald knelt down beside her, and in low

And brochetonnes of tremulous agony,

Called on the name of her so lately loved,

And gazed upon his face in voiceless woe.

And ever, as he turned to leave her sight,

She stretched towards him one imploring hand

Which clutched his steps, and then relaxed again

Into its nerveless listlessness. Once more

His foot was on the threshold, and her eyes

Grew dim with their intensity of grief,

Chained as they were to his retreating form.

She could not speak—her lips were sealed by woe.

And with a sigh whereof her tortured heart

At last found bitter intercession—she sank

Lifeless upon the marble floor, and blood

Gushed from her regal forehead as she fell:

Oswald knelt down beside her, and in low

And brochetonnes of tremulous agony,

Called on the name of her so lately loved,

And gazed upon his face in voiceless woe.

And ever, as he turned to leave her sight,

THE TRUE AMERICAN

"GOD AND LIBERTY."

LEXINGTON, TUESDAY, JULY 8.

THE RIGHT OF SEARCH—THE SLAVE TRADE.

In saying that the American people have become the sole propagandists of slavery among men, we wish, if possible, to arouse the public to the fact, in order, if we are not dead to our peculiar glory of being the "defenders of liberty," that we may retrace our steps, before it is forever too late. We do not propose, in this article, to notice the supremacy which the slave power has acquired since the formation of the constitution, contrary to the expectations and wishes of its illustrious founders, in the home administration—how it has monopolized all the offices of honor and profit—in the civil administration—in the army, and in the navy;—this would require more space than a newspaper article would allow. We shall therefore confine ourselves, mainly, now, to our foreign policy. Up to the year 1845, says the Foreign Quarterly Review, April No., 1845, the Right of belligerence to search neutral vessels "was not questioned." Lord Stowell sums up the whole international law upon the subject, by these propositions.

1. "That the right of visiting and searching merchant ships upon the high seas, and not merely their papers, but their cargoes, whatever be the ship, its cargo, or its destiny, is an incontestable right of the lawfully commissioned cruisers of every belligerent nation.

2. That the sovereign of the neutral country cannot, consistently with the law of nations, oppose this right of search.

3. That the penalty of opposing this right of search, is the confiscation of property so withheld from visitation." The Quarterly goes on to say, that this doctrine is sustained by Bynkershoek, Vattel, Voet, Zutrius, Sococenius, and Abreu, and is also set forth in "Il Consolato del Mare." Bynkershoek says, "Non ex facili forte aplustri, sed ex ipsius instrumentis in navi repertis constare operet navem amicam esse. Si id constet dimittat: si hostilem esse constitutum est: Quod si licet, utrumque liceat et perpetuo obseruator, licetque quoque instrumentaque ad merces pertinet extremitate inde discede si quo hostium bonum in navi lateant."

Vattel admits (Quæ. Publ. Jur: Vattel, Droit de Gens lib. II, ch. 7, p. 114.) that without searching neutral ships at sea, the commerce of contraband goods cannot be prevented. He says also: "Si l'on trouve sur un vaisseau neutre des effets appartenants aux ennemis, ou s'en suscitent par le droit de la guerre." Valin, a French lawyer of European reputation in his "Traité des Prises," justifies the French ordinances, by which both ships and cargo are subject to confiscation, if the smallest part of the lading belonged to the enemy, for, he observes:—"Parce que de maître ou d'autre c'est favoriser le commerce qui rapporte à l'ennemi. Mais cette auteur est absolument déçue pour les neutrals, et semble n'avoir écrit que pour plaire leur cause. Il pose d'abord ses principes qu'il donne pour constants, puis il tire les conséquences qui lui conviennent, Cette méthode est fort commode."

The learned reviewer then goes on to prove incontestably that the French Courts sustained, under the old régime, most fully the propositions laid down by Lord Stowell, and concludes his argument by a quotation from the Spanish of Abreu upon the subject of blockade and the rights of neutrals, which we omit. Now, it is plain that "the right of search or visit" was the admitted law of nations up to the time of the declaration of war against England, in 1812. It was not the right of search against which the American people battled. Let us go back a little. In May, 1806, England declared the coast of France and her allies blockaded from Brent to the mouth of the Elbe. The error here was declaiming blockade without sufficient power of enforcement. We, as neutrals, were carrying on a profitable trade with the continent, and England, through envy or an arrogant supremacy, determined to break it up. Bonaparte immediately issued his celebrated Berlin decree, declaring the British Isles in blockade; these followed, in 1807, the orders in council of Great Britain, declaring all France in blockade, and requiring all ships to touch at British ports and pay duties before they would be allowed to enter French ports. Napoleon reports from Milan that the British Isles are in blockade, and that all neutrals trading with them, or allowing their imports, are "denationalized" and confiscated: following this up with his tremendous continental system that all British goods even on land are "contraband." The United States, thus between two fires, was literally crushed. She first tried the embargo—then protestations and diplomacy—and at last appealed to arms. "Millions for defense—not a cent for tribute," was the war-cry: "Free trade and sailor's rights." Not a word denying the right of "visit" was uttered in the whole lengthy correspondence.

* Not from the fallacious claims of the Flag, but from the papers found in the ship, it ought to appear that the ship is a friend, a neutral. If this appears, I dismiss it, if it turns out an enemy, I will then consider it.

† Because it is to some extent favoring the commerce of the enemy and facilitating the transportation of his goods and merchandise; which is not in accordance with treaties of alliance or neutrality.

‡ Because it is to some extent favoring the commerce of the enemy and facilitating the transportation of his goods and merchandise; which is not in accordance with treaties of alliance or neutrality.

§ Not from the fallacious claims of the Flag, but from the papers found in the ship, it ought to appear that the ship is a friend, a neutral. If this appears, I dismiss it, if it turns out an enemy, I will then consider it.

|| Because it is to some extent favoring the commerce of the enemy and facilitating the transportation of his goods and merchandise; which is not in accordance with treaties of alliance or neutrality.

¶ Not from the fallacious claims of the Flag, but from the papers found in the ship, it ought to appear that the ship is a friend, a neutral. If this appears, I dismiss it, if it turns out an enemy, I will then consider it.

** Not from the fallacious claims of the Flag, but from the papers found in the ship, it ought to appear that the ship is a friend, a neutral. If this appears, I dismiss it, if it turns out an enemy, I will then consider it.

||| Not from the fallacious claims of the Flag, but from the papers found in the ship, it ought to appear that the ship is a friend, a neutral. If this appears, I dismiss it, if it turns out an enemy, I will then consider it.

**** Not from the fallacious claims of the Flag, but from the papers found in the ship, it ought to appear that the ship is a friend, a neutral. If this appears, I dismiss it, if it turns out an enemy, I will then consider it.

***** Not from the fallacious claims of the Flag, but from the papers found in the ship, it ought to appear that the ship is a friend, a neutral. If this appears, I dismiss it, if it turns out an enemy, I will then consider it.

|||| Not from the fallacious claims of the Flag, but from the papers found in the ship, it ought to appear that the ship is a friend, a neutral. If this appears, I dismiss it, if it turns out an enemy, I will then consider it.

||||| Not from the fallacious claims of the Flag, but from the papers found in the ship, it ought to appear that the ship is a friend, a neutral. If this appears, I dismiss it, if it turns out an enemy, I will then consider it.

|||||| Not from the fallacious claims of the Flag, but from the papers found in the ship, it ought to appear that the ship is a friend, a neutral. If this appears, I dismiss it, if it turns out an enemy, I will then consider it.

||||||| Not from the fallacious claims of the Flag, but from the papers found in the ship, it ought to appear that the ship is a friend, a neutral. If this appears, I dismiss it, if it turns out an enemy, I will then consider it.

||||||| Not from the fallacious claims of the Flag, but from the papers found in the ship, it ought to appear that the ship is a friend, a neutral. If this appears, I dismiss it, if it turns out an enemy, I will then consider it.

||||||| Not from the fallacious claims of the Flag, but from the papers found in the ship, it ought to appear that the ship is a friend, a neutral. If this appears, I dismiss it, if it turns out an enemy, I will then consider it.

||||||| Not from the fallacious claims of the Flag, but from the papers found in the ship, it ought to appear that the ship is a friend, a neutral. If this appears, I dismiss it, if it turns out an enemy, I will then consider it.

||||||| Not from the fallacious claims of the Flag, but from the papers found in the ship, it ought to appear that the ship is a friend, a neutral. If this appears, I dismiss it, if it turns out an enemy, I will then consider it.

||||||| Not from the fallacious claims of the Flag, but from the papers found in the ship, it ought to appear that the ship is a friend, a neutral. If this appears, I dismiss it, if it turns out an enemy, I will then consider it.

||||||| Not from the fallacious claims of the Flag, but from the papers found in the ship, it ought to appear that the ship is a friend, a neutral. If this appears, I dismiss it, if it turns out an enemy, I will then consider it.

||||||| Not from the fallacious claims of the Flag, but from the papers found in the ship, it ought to appear that the ship is a friend, a neutral. If this appears, I dismiss it, if it turns out an enemy, I will then consider it.

||||||| Not from the fallacious claims of the Flag, but from the papers found in the ship, it ought to appear that the ship is a friend, a neutral. If this appears, I dismiss it, if it turns out an enemy, I will then consider it.

||||||| Not from the fallacious claims of the Flag, but from the papers found in the ship, it ought to appear that the ship is a friend, a neutral. If this appears, I dismiss it, if it turns out an enemy, I will then consider it.

||||||| Not from the fallacious claims of the Flag, but from the papers found in the ship, it ought to appear that the ship is a friend, a neutral. If this appears, I dismiss it, if it turns out an enemy, I will then consider it.

||||||| Not from the fallacious claims of the Flag, but from the papers found in the ship, it ought to appear that the ship is a friend, a neutral. If this appears, I dismiss it, if it turns out an enemy, I will then consider it.

||||||| Not from the fallacious claims of the Flag, but from the papers found in the ship, it ought to appear that the ship is a friend, a neutral. If this appears, I dismiss it, if it turns out an enemy, I will then consider it.

||||||| Not from the fallacious claims of the Flag, but from the papers found in the ship, it ought to appear that the ship is a friend, a neutral. If this appears, I dismiss it, if it turns out an enemy, I will then consider it.

||||||| Not from the fallacious claims of the Flag, but from the papers found in the ship, it ought to appear that the ship is a friend, a neutral. If this appears, I dismiss it, if it turns out an enemy, I will then consider it.

||||||| Not from the fallacious claims of the Flag, but from the papers found in the ship, it ought to appear that the ship is a friend, a neutral. If this appears, I dismiss it, if it turns out an enemy, I will then consider it.

||||||| Not from the fallacious claims of the Flag, but from the papers found in the ship, it ought to appear that the ship is a friend, a neutral. If this appears, I dismiss it, if it turns out an enemy, I will then consider it.

||||||| Not from the fallacious claims of the Flag, but from the papers found in the ship, it ought to appear that the ship is a friend, a neutral. If this appears, I dismiss it, if it turns out an enemy, I will then consider it.

||||||| Not from the fallacious claims of the Flag, but from the papers found in the ship, it ought to appear that the ship is a friend, a neutral. If this appears, I dismiss it, if it turns out an enemy, I will then consider it.

||||||| Not from the fallacious claims of the Flag, but from the papers found in the ship, it ought to appear that the ship is a friend, a neutral. If this appears, I dismiss it, if it turns out an enemy, I will then consider it.

||||||| Not from the fallacious claims of the Flag, but from the papers found in the ship, it ought to appear that the ship is a friend, a neutral. If this appears, I dismiss it, if it turns out an enemy, I will then consider it.

||||||| Not from the fallacious claims of the Flag, but from the papers found in the ship, it ought to appear that the ship is a friend, a neutral. If this appears, I dismiss it, if it turns out an enemy, I will then consider it.

||||||| Not from the fallacious claims of the Flag, but from the papers found in the ship, it ought to appear that the ship is a friend, a neutral. If this appears, I dismiss it, if it turns out an enemy, I will then consider it.

||||||| Not from the fallacious claims of the Flag, but from the papers found in the ship, it ought to appear that the ship is a friend, a neutral. If this appears, I dismiss it, if it turns out an enemy, I will then consider it.

||||||| Not from the fallacious claims of the Flag, but from the papers found in the ship, it ought to appear that the ship is a friend, a neutral. If this appears, I dismiss it, if it turns out an enemy, I will then consider it.

||||||| Not from the fallacious claims of the Flag, but from the papers found in the ship, it ought to appear that the ship is a friend, a neutral. If this appears, I dismiss it, if it turns out an enemy, I will then consider it.

||||||| Not from the fallacious claims of the Flag, but from the papers found in the ship, it ought to appear that the ship is a friend, a neutral. If this appears, I dismiss it, if it turns out an enemy, I will then consider it.

||||||| Not from the fallacious claims of the Flag, but from the papers found in the ship, it ought to appear that the ship is a friend, a neutral. If this appears, I dismiss it, if it turns out an enemy, I will then consider it.

||||||| Not from the fallacious claims of the Flag, but from the papers found in the ship, it ought to appear that the ship is a friend, a neutral. If this appears, I dismiss it, if it turns out an enemy, I will then consider it.

||||||| Not from the fallacious claims of the Flag, but from the papers found in the ship, it ought to appear that the ship is a friend, a neutral. If this appears, I dismiss it, if it turns out an enemy, I will then consider it.

||||||| Not from the fallacious claims of the Flag, but from the papers found in the ship, it ought to appear that the ship is a friend, a neutral. If this appears, I dismiss it, if it turns out an enemy, I will then consider it.

||||||| Not from the fallacious claims of the Flag, but from the papers found in the ship, it ought to appear that the ship is a friend, a neutral. If this appears, I dismiss it, if it turns out an enemy, I will then consider it.

||||||| Not from the fallacious claims of the Flag, but from the papers found in the ship, it ought to appear that the ship is a friend, a neutral. If this appears, I dismiss it, if it turns out an enemy, I will then consider it.

||||||| Not from the fallacious claims of the Flag, but from the papers found in the ship, it ought to appear that the ship is a friend, a neutral. If this appears, I dismiss it, if it turns out an enemy, I will then consider it.

||||||| Not from the fallacious claims of the Flag, but from the papers found in the ship, it ought to appear that the ship is a friend, a neutral. If this appears, I dismiss it, if it turns out an enemy, I will then consider it.

||||||| Not from the fallacious claims of the Flag, but from the papers found in the ship, it ought to appear that the ship is a friend, a neutral. If this appears, I dismiss it, if it turns out an enemy, I will then consider it.

||||||| Not from the fallacious claims of the Flag, but from the papers found in the ship, it ought to appear that the ship is a friend, a neutral. If this appears, I dismiss it, if it turns out an enemy, I will then consider it.

||||||| Not from the fallacious claims of the Flag, but from the papers found in the ship, it ought to appear that the ship is a friend, a neutral. If this appears, I dismiss it, if it turns out an enemy, I will then consider it.

||||||| Not from the fallacious claims of the Flag, but from the papers found in the ship, it ought to appear that the ship is a friend, a neutral. If this appears, I dismiss it, if it turns out an enemy, I will then consider it.

||||||| Not from the fallacious claims of the Flag, but from the papers found in the ship, it ought to appear that the ship is a friend, a neutral. If this appears, I dismiss it, if it turns out an enemy, I will then consider it.

||||||| Not from the fallacious claims of the Flag, but from the papers found in the ship, it ought to appear that the ship is a friend, a neutral. If this appears, I dismiss it, if it turns out an enemy, I will then consider it.

||||||| Not from the fallacious claims of the Flag, but from the papers found in the ship, it ought to appear that the ship is a friend, a neutral. If this appears, I dismiss it, if it turns out an enemy, I will then consider it.

||||||| Not from the fallacious claims of the Flag, but from the papers found in the ship, it ought to appear that the ship is a friend, a neutral. If this appears, I dismiss it, if it turns out an enemy, I will then consider it.

||||||| Not from the fallacious claims of the Flag, but from the papers found in the ship, it ought to appear that the ship is a friend, a neutral. If this appears, I dismiss it, if it turns out an enemy, I will then consider it.

||||||| Not from the fallacious claims of the Flag, but from the papers found in the ship, it ought to appear that the ship is a friend, a neutral. If this appears, I dismiss it, if it turns out an enemy, I will then consider it.

||||||| Not from the fallacious claims of the Flag, but from the papers found in the ship, it ought to appear that the ship is a friend, a neutral. If this appears, I dismiss it, if it turns out an enemy, I will then consider it.

||||||| Not from the fallacious claims of the Flag, but from the papers found in the ship, it ought to appear that the ship is a friend, a neutral. If this appears, I dismiss it, if it turns out an enemy, I will then consider it.

||||||| Not from the fallacious claims of the Flag, but from the papers found in the ship, it ought to appear that the ship is a friend, a neutral. If this appears, I dismiss it, if it turns out an enemy, I will then consider it.

||||||| Not from the fallacious claims of the Flag, but from the papers found in the ship, it ought to appear that the ship is a friend, a neutral. If this appears, I dismiss it, if it turns out an enemy, I will then consider it.

||||||| Not from the fallacious claims of the Flag, but from the papers found in the ship, it ought to appear that the ship is a friend, a neutral. If this appears, I dismiss it, if it turns out an enemy, I will then consider it.

||||||| Not from the fallacious claims of the Flag, but from the papers found in the ship, it ought to appear that the ship is a friend, a neutral. If this appears, I dismiss it, if it turns out an enemy, I will then consider it.

||||||| Not from the fallacious claims of the Flag, but from the papers found in the ship, it ought to appear that the ship is a friend, a neutral. If this appears, I dismiss it, if it turns out an enemy, I will then consider it.

||||||| Not from the fallacious claims of the Flag, but from the papers found in the ship, it ought to appear that the ship is a friend, a neutral. If this appears, I dismiss it, if it turns out an enemy, I will then consider it.

||||||| Not from the fallacious claims of the Flag, but from the papers found in the ship, it ought to appear that the ship is a friend, a neutral. If this appears, I dismiss it, if it turns out an enemy, I will then consider it.

||||||| Not from the fallacious claims of the Flag, but from the papers found in the ship, it ought to appear that the ship is a friend, a neutral. If this appears, I dismiss it, if it turns out an enemy, I will then consider it.

||||||| Not from the fallacious claims of the Flag, but from the papers found in the ship, it ought to appear that the ship is a friend, a neutral. If this appears, I dismiss it, if it turns out an enemy, I will then consider it.

||||||| Not from the fallacious claims of the Flag, but from the papers found in the ship, it ought to appear that the ship is a friend, a neutral. If this appears, I dismiss it, if it turns out an enemy,

PRO-SLAVERY.

From the Lexington Inquirer.
PROGRESS AND ABOLITION.

The world abounds at this time with doctoines which are destitute of all merit, save novelty and extravagance, and with infatuated visionaries who coax themselves into the belief that they are the chosen apostles of the new lights, and scheming speculators who trade in paradoxes and patent-right philanthropy.

Amidst the motley mass of the real and imaginary discoveries and inventions of the present age, of course, much that is useful and excellent in its kind is produced. But in the estimation of the wisest, it is considered very questionable, whether the world is, or, not, losing as much of the glories and excellencies of the past, in the process of change, as it gains by the inventions and improvements of the present times. The arguments which are adduced in favor of the position that all classes in this country were happier half a century ago than they now are, comprise truth and reason enough to make them more than plausible. If then, the "more majorum" of Roman veneration—the tried and approved customs of our ancestors, are too sacred and precious to be lightly assailed in any respect, what must a patriotic and reverent people think of a scheme, which, under the alluring and delusive name of "human progress," aims, at one blow, to demolish landmarks raised and ordained by the wisdom of ages, and the necessities of mankind? Much indignant eloquence and biting invective are hurled against such arguments as those. It is said, that they are revolting to the "spirit of the age," that they are unworthy to be used except by the Chinese; and that the advancing tide of "human progress," towards human perfection, "sweeps majestically over such antiquated prejudices, and buries the past, with its sympathies and obligations in oblivion, which the detestable and shortsighted policy of our ancestors deserves, in a word, that "progress" demands the immediate abolition of Slavery in Kentucky, that abolitionism and progress are identical.

If these philosophic lovers of their kind, would deign to rend the lesson which the history of civilization imparts, they would discover that no concerted and premeditated movements, either of political, or moral force, ever has, or probably, ever can produce such an effect of directly amending the condition, and promoting the interests of the human race, as they profess to believe would be the result of the immediate abolition of slavery. And they would further learn that instead of the real progress of the world, in improvement, being accelerated by such a movement, it would, in fact, be obstructed as far as the wreck and ruin of a mighty convolution could obstruct.

Let us, in our leisure, assume some suitable starting point in the history of the civilized world, and trace the ancient channels of this mighty tide of human progress. Let us examine whether the welfare and advancement of the human race were most promoted by sudden efforts, or the gradual natural process of necessary change. The inevitable result of such an investigation, is conviction to every rational unprejudiced mind, that the one invariable rule of Divine Providence, has been, and will be, that all great, social and moral changes affecting the mass of mankind, must be the gradual effects of continuing causes. It would be reasonable to expect to find fertility in the ashes and lava of a volcanic eruption, as to anticipate permanent good to the human family, from a sudden and convulsive social movement; such as the immediate abolition of slavery in Kentucky necessarily would be.

Without advertising particularly to the various other events and principles, which, in the rotation of political and social existence, had lent their impetus to the wonderful and complex machine of advancing civilization, let us briefly glance at the demolition of the feudal system. That vast fabric, although it bore little resemblance in its details to the institution of domestic slavery in this country, presents nevertheless, in its double aspect of long, and deeply fixed, municipal and social relations, the most striking analogy in modern history. In the march of improvement, the feudal system has been swept away with all its gorgeous and heroic incidents. The days of chivalry are past. By what means was this important change effected? Was it by the action of an anti-feudal society of zealous members, stimulated by puffy declaimers about "progress" and the "spirit of the age," and such stereotyped trash? Was it by national legislation, or physical force? No. Was it the work of a day, a year, or even a century? No. It was the result of decay on the one side, and invigoration on the other, that from a thousand causes, physical, social, religious, and political, became a part of the inevitable necessity of existence, which devout men denounce as the "providence of Almighty God," and which the heaven-daring skeptics of these times, style "the natural progress of man towards perfection." It was a substantial triumph of the oppressed millions over their iron-handed oppressors; achieved in the only manner, and by the only means by which such triumphs ever have been, or can be accomplished.

If, indeed, there are evils connected with Slavery, policy and humanity imperiously dictate the redress of those wrongs, so far as that redress is compatible with the continuance of the institution; and if the abolition of Slavery, should ever become a desirable object, the same high considerations indicate the necessity of first adapting the negro to the reception of the boon of liberty. But it remains yet to be shown, that the slaves in other lands, who perform the menial duties of life, are in any respect happier, or more comfortable than the slaves are in Kentucky. And it is highly questionable, whether any attempted partial reform of the seeming abuses of slavery, would have a general beneficial tendency, for the reason that the general condition of the slaves, is already undergoing a gradual amelioration, the steadiness and certainty of which, would be likely to be disturbed by a formal attempt at interference of any kind. Such has already been, to a certain extent, the effect of abolitionists even at a distance.

The abolitionists, conscious of the weakness of the position, that the negro would be benefited by emancipation, do not urge it with half the zeal, with which they press the argument that slavery is the greatest of curses to the master. To prove this point, they assume moral and religious grounds in the very teeth of the Scripturites. They further assume, as axiomatic, that "wealth, numbers in new countries, literature, the mechanic arts, scientific agriculture, &c.," are indisputable elements of national prosperity and glory, and then plunge into statistics to show how superior New York is to Virginia, and Ohio to Kentucky. These are the most specious fallacies used by these philosophers, and their ingenuity raises them to something like the dignity of argument. It is true, that the various ingredients detailed, are, in their proper spheres, incident to national greatness; but in reference to "wealth," it may be said, that the more equal distribution which distinguishes the wealth of Kentucky and Virginia, (where there is no

lass of white slaves,) is a higher ingredient of national greatness and glory, than the alternation of nabobs and paupers, who constitute the population of the vaunted "free states." "Numbers" of high-spirited, true-hearted citizens, are justly esteemed an important element of glory and greatness; but when "numbers" are made up us they are in Ohio, they are rather a national curse, than a blessing. The nutting "literature" of our Yankee brethren, is worse than no literature, but such as it is, the South has a proportionate quantity, if not bad, and worse it cannot be. On this score, the less said by either side the better, although GRISWOLD, a Yankee poet himself, claims that there are 70 or 80 live Yankee poets.] When Northern men claim that they do all the work in the country, the dainty pork and molasses which they swallow, ought to choke them into a knowledge of the fact, that they are the products of the past, in the process of change, as it gains by the inventions and improvements of the present times. The arguments which are adduced in favor of the position that all classes in this country were happier half a century ago than they now are, comprise truth and reason enough to make them more than plausible. If then,

the "more majorum" of Roman veneration—the tried and approved customs of our ancestors, are too sacred and precious to be lightly assailed in any respect, what must a patriotic and reverent people think of a scheme, which, under the alluring and delusive name of "human progress," aims, at one blow, to demolish landmarks raised and ordained by the wisdom of ages, and the necessities of mankind? Much indignant eloquence and biting invective are hurled against such arguments as those. It is said, that they are revolting to the "spirit of the age," that they are unworthy to be used except by the Chinese; and that the advancing tide of "human progress," towards human perfection, "sweeps majestically over such antiquated prejudices, and buries the past, with its sympathies and obligations in oblivion, which the detestable and shortsighted policy of our ancestors deserves, in a word, that "progress" demands the immediate abolition of Slavery in Kentucky, that abolitionism and progress are identical.

If these philosophic lovers of their kind, would deign to rend the lesson which the history of civilization imparts, they would discover that no concerted and premeditated movements, either of political, or moral force, ever has, or probably, ever can produce such an effect of directly amending the condition, and promoting the interests of the human race, as they profess to believe would be the result of the immediate abolition of slavery. And they would further learn that instead of the real progress of the world, in improvement, being accelerated by such a movement, it would, in fact, be obstructed as far as the wreck and ruin of a mighty convolution could obstruct.

Let us, in our leisure, assume some suitable starting point in the history of the civilized world, and trace the ancient channels of this mighty tide of human progress. Let us examine whether the welfare and advancement of the human race were most promoted by sudden efforts, or the gradual natural process of necessary change. The inevitable result of such an investigation, is conviction to every rational unprejudiced mind, that the one invariable rule of Divine Providence, has been, and will be, that all great, social and moral changes affecting the mass of mankind, must be the gradual effects of continuing causes. It would be reasonable to expect to find fertility in the ashes and lava of a volcanic eruption, as to anticipate permanent good to the human family, from a sudden and convulsive social movement; such as the immediate abolition of slavery in Kentucky necessarily would be.

Without advertising particularly to the various other events and principles, which, in the rotation of political and social existence, had lent their impetus to the wonderful and complex machine of advancing civilization, let us briefly glance at the demolition of the feudal system. That vast fabric, although it bore little resemblance in its details to the institution of domestic slavery in this country, presents nevertheless, in its double aspect of long, and deeply fixed, municipal and social relations, the most striking analogy in modern history. In the march of improvement, the feudal system has been swept away with all its gorgeous and heroic incidents. The days of chivalry are past. By what means was this important change effected? Was it by the action of an anti-feudal society of zealous members, stimulated by puffy declaimers about "progress" and the "spirit of the age," and such stereotyped trash? Was it by national legislation, or physical force? No. Was it the work of a day, a year, or even a century? No. It was the result of decay on the one side, and invigoration on the other, that from a thousand causes, physical, social, religious, and political, became a part of the inevitable necessity of existence, which devout men denounce as the "providence of Almighty God," and which the heaven-daring skeptics of these times, style "the natural progress of man towards perfection." It was a substantial triumph of the oppressed millions over their iron-handed oppressors; achieved in the only manner, and by the only means by which such triumphs ever have been, or can be accomplished.

If, indeed, there are evils connected with Slavery, policy and humanity imperiously dictate the redress of those wrongs, so far as that redress is compatible with the continuance of the institution; and if the abolition of Slavery, should ever become a desirable object, the same high considerations indicate the necessity of first adapting the negro to the reception of the boon of liberty. But it remains yet to be shown, that the slaves in other lands, who perform the menial duties of life, are in any respect happier, or more comfortable than the slaves are in Kentucky. And it is highly questionable, whether any attempted partial reform of the seeming abuses of slavery, would have a general beneficial tendency, for the reason that the general condition of the slaves, is already undergoing a gradual amelioration, the steadiness and certainty of which, would be likely to be disturbed by a formal attempt at interference of any kind. Such has already been, to a certain extent, the effect of abolitionists even at a distance.

The abolitionists, conscious of the weakness of the position, that the negro would be benefited by emancipation, do not urge it with half the zeal, with which they press the argument that slavery is the greatest of curses to the master. To prove this point, they assume moral and religious grounds in the very teeth of the Scripturites. They further assume, as axiomatic, that "wealth, numbers in new countries, literature, the mechanic arts, scientific agriculture, &c.," are indisputable elements of national prosperity and glory, and then plunge into statistics to show how superior New York is to Virginia, and Ohio to Kentucky. These are the most specious fallacies used by these philosophers, and their ingenuity raises them to something like the dignity of argument. It is true, that the various ingredients detailed, are, in their proper spheres, incident to national greatness; but in reference to "wealth," it may be said, that the more equal distribution which distinguishes the wealth of Kentucky and Virginia, (where there is no

AGRICULTURAL.

FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL NEWS.

By the arrival of the steam packet Britannia, we have our European journals to the 4th of May.

MARKETS.—Ashes neglected and consumption falling off. Cotton has advanced to \$14 per lb., and a large business was done in it. It is considered, however, a mere speculative movement, in consequence of the Oregon question, and that price will recede again. Stock on hand \$60,000,000.

MONEY.—The money market is quiet, though the price of gold is still above par. The Bank of England has advanced to £100 per £100, per cent. The Bank of France has risen to 100 francs, and the Bank of Germany to 100 marks.

PEAS.—The price of peas has advanced to 100 francs per bushel, and the Bank of France has risen to 100 francs per bushel.

RED CEDAR.—The price of red cedar has advanced to 100 francs per bushel.

IRON.—The price of iron has advanced to 100 francs per ton.

COAL.—The price of coal has advanced to 100 francs per ton.

WHEAT.—The price of wheat has advanced to 100 francs per bushel.

BARLEY.—The price of barley has advanced to 100 francs per bushel.

PEAS.—The price of peas has advanced to 100 francs per bushel.

RED CEDAR.—The price of red cedar has advanced to 100 francs per bushel.

IRON.—The price of iron has advanced to 100 francs per ton.

COAL.—The price of coal has advanced to 100 francs per ton.

WHEAT.—The price of wheat has advanced to 100 francs per bushel.

BARLEY.—The price of barley has advanced to 100 francs per bushel.

PEAS.—The price of peas has advanced to 100 francs per bushel.

RED CEDAR.—The price of red cedar has advanced to 100 francs per bushel.

IRON.—The price of iron has advanced to 100 francs per ton.

COAL.—The price of coal has advanced to 100 francs per ton.

WHEAT.—The price of wheat has advanced to 100 francs per bushel.

BARLEY.—The price of barley has advanced to 100 francs per bushel.

PEAS.—The price of peas has advanced to 100 francs per bushel.

RED CEDAR.—The price of red cedar has advanced to 100 francs per bushel.

IRON.—The price of iron has advanced to 100 francs per ton.

COAL.—The price of coal has advanced to 100 francs per ton.

WHEAT.—The price of wheat has advanced to 100 francs per bushel.

BARLEY.—The price of barley has advanced to 100 francs per bushel.

PEAS.—The price of peas has advanced to 100 francs per bushel.

RED CEDAR.—The price of red cedar has advanced to 100 francs per bushel.

IRON.—The price of iron has advanced to 100 francs per ton.

COAL.—The price of coal has advanced to 100 francs per ton.

WHEAT.—The price of wheat has advanced to 100 francs per bushel.

BARLEY.—The price of barley has advanced to 100 francs per bushel.

PEAS.—The price of peas has advanced to 100 francs per bushel.

RED CEDAR.—The price of red cedar has advanced to 100 francs per bushel.

IRON.—The price of iron has advanced to 100 francs per ton.

COAL.—The price of coal has advanced to 100 francs per ton.

WHEAT.—The price of wheat has advanced to 100 francs per bushel.

BARLEY.—The price of barley has advanced to 100 francs per bushel.

PEAS.—The price of peas has advanced to 100 francs per bushel.

RED CEDAR.—The price of red cedar has advanced to 100 francs per bushel.

IRON.—The price of iron has advanced to 100 francs per ton.

COAL.—The price of coal has advanced to 100 francs per ton.

WHEAT.—The price of wheat has advanced to 100 francs per bushel.

BARLEY.—The price of barley has advanced to 100 francs per bushel.

PEAS.—The price of peas has advanced to 100 francs per bushel.

RED CEDAR.—The price of red cedar has advanced to 100 francs per bushel.

IRON.—The price of iron has advanced to 100 francs per ton.

COAL.—The price of coal has advanced to 100 francs per ton.

WHEAT.—The price of wheat has advanced to 100 francs per bushel.

BARLEY.—The price of barley has advanced to 100 francs per bushel.

PEAS.—The price of peas has advanced to 100 francs per bushel.

RED CEDAR.—The price of red cedar has advanced to 100 francs per bushel.

IRON.—The price of iron has advanced to 100 francs per ton.

COAL.—The price of coal has advanced to 100 francs per ton.

WHEAT.—The price of wheat has advanced to 100 francs per bushel.

BARLEY.—The price of barley has advanced to 100 francs per bushel.

PEAS.—The price of peas has advanced to 100 francs per bushel.

RED CEDAR.—The price of red cedar has advanced to 100 francs per bushel.

IRON.—The price of iron has advanced to 100 francs per ton.

COAL.—The price of coal has advanced to 100 francs per ton.

WHEAT.—The price of wheat has advanced to 100 francs per bushel.

BARLEY.—The price of barley has advanced to 100 francs per bushel.

PEAS.—The price of peas has advanced to 100 francs per bushel.

RED CEDAR.—The price of red cedar has advanced to 100 francs per bushel.

IRON.—The price of iron has advanced to 100 francs per ton.

COAL.—The price of coal has advanced to 100 francs per ton.

WHEAT.—The price of wheat has advanced to 100 francs per bushel.

BARLEY.—The price of barley has advanced to 100 francs per bushel.

PEAS.—The price of peas has advanced to 100 francs per bushel.

RED CEDAR.—The price of red cedar has advanced to 100 francs per bushel.

IRON.—The price of iron has advanced to 100 francs per ton.

COAL.—The price of coal has advanced to 100 francs per ton.

WHEAT.—The price of wheat has advanced to 100 francs per